

From: "Tim Trohimovich" <timtro@timtro.seanet.com>
To: <miles.mayhew@seattle.gov>
Date: 3/16/2005 10:05:13 PM
Subject: Comments on the City of Seattle Environmental Critical Areas Regulations Update

Dear Mr. Mayhew:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the update. I also appreciate the department's hard work. However, I recommend the following changes to strengthen the update:

| Proposed SMC 25.09.200(D) provides that "the Director may condition development on parcels containing wildlife habitat to encourage preserving contiguous fish or wildlife habitat corridors." This language should be changed to provide that the Director shall condition development on parcels containing wildlife habitat or their buffers to protect the functions and values contiguous fish or wildlife habitat corridors.

| Seattle must adopt buffer provisions to protect its salt water shorelines with appropriate provisions for port facilities, marinas, docks, and maintaining views.

| Seattle needs to adopt a buffer for type 1 waters. These include Seattle's important salmon rivers such as the Duwamish River. This is required to protect the rivers functions and values and water quality. It is also required by the Growth Management Act.

| The type 2 through 5 stream buffers in proposed SMC 25.09.200(A)(3)(d)(1) are too narrow to provide adequate protection for salmon streams and the wildlife functions of riparian corridors. The important functions of these areas and the buffers needed to protect them are detained in the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife's Management Recommendations for Washington's Priority Habitats: Riparian on the CAO on CD.

| I support provisions and incentives to provide for better buffers during redevelopment.

| Proposed SMC 25.09.020(C) and SMC 25.09.160(B)(1)'s provisions exempting wetlands smaller than 100 square feet and category IV wetlands smaller than 1,000 square feet from protection should be eliminated. They will prevent achievement of the cities policy for no loss of wetland area and wetland functions and values.

| Proposed SMC 25.09.160(B)(1) & (E)'s wetland buffers of 100 to 50 feet are inadequate to protect wetland functions and values. The averaging provisions can reduce them further. I recommend that you adopt buffers similar to the Washington State Department of Ecology's Alternative 3 buffers.

| SMC 25.09.160(A)'s criteria for when wetlands can be impacted are inadequate to protect wetlands, especially Seattle's very limited but very important tidal and riparian wetlands. The criteria from the State of Washington Department of Community Trade and Economic Development's (CTED's) Example Code Provisions for Designating and Protecting Critical Areas should be adopted.

| We appreciate and strongly support the approved mitigation ratios and provisions in proposed SMC 25.09.160. These improvements will help protect the functions and values of critical areas.

| Proposed SMC 25.09.240(E) should be amended to allow critical areas to be included in residential density calculations. This will reduce property owner concerns about critical area buffers and provide for appropriate residential densities in the city. SMC
<<http://clerk.ci.seattle.wa.us/~scripts/nph-brs.exe?s1=25.09&s2=&S3=&Sect4=AND&l=20&Sect1=IMAGE&Sect3=PLURON&Sect5=CODE1&d=CODE&p=1&u=/~public/code1.htm&r=15&Sect6=HITOFF&f=G#h0#h0>>
<<http://clerk.ci.seattle.wa.us/~scripts/nph-brs.exe?s1=25.09&s2=&S3=&Sect4=AND&l=20&Sect1=IMAGE&Sect3=PLURON&Sect5=CODE1&d=CODE&p=1&u=/~public/code1.htm&r=15&Sect6=HITOFF&f=G#h2#h2>> 25.09.260 allows recovery of residential density through an administrative conditional use permit process, but this added process is in my opinion unnecessary.

Please include my comments in record of the update. I am a property owner and resident of the City of Seattle.

Tim Trohimovich

timtro@seanet.com

505 East Denny Way, Number 607

Seattle, Washington 98122